DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 921 EA 010 417

AUTHOR Colb, Norman H.
TITLE Paraprofessionals in the Public Schools of Massachusetts: Current Status and Future Prospects.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunities.
PUB DATE 17 Feb 77
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Development; *Staff Role; State Aid; State Programs; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the themes and presents the recommendations that grew out of a conference on the use of paraprofessionals in schools, which was held in January 1977 at the behest of the Massachusetts Department of Education. The report is organized in three sections. The first section presents a number of major themes that ran through both days of the conference. These themes combine statements of problems and general solutions to those problems. The second section details a specific set of actions that would allow the state, working in a few urban school sites, to establish exemplary paraprofessional programs that could serve as models for expanded efforts in additional sites. The third section presents a brief scenario for moving from support for exemplary programs to implementing funding guidelines throughout the state. (Author/JG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity

ED151921

Recommendations on Paraprofessional Staff

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Di Bella

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

April 1977

EA 010 417

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Charles B. Grigsby, Chairperson
Anne H. McHugh, Vice Chairperson

Mary Barros
John Bond
Julie Donahue
James L. Green
Howard A. Greis
Mary Ann Hardenbergh
Joseph C. Mello
Evelyn Morash
Edward E. Phillips

Gregory R. Anrig, Commissioner of Education
Secretary

Ex Officio Member:
Leroy Keith, Jr., Chancellor, Board of Higher Education

Prepared by the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
Charles L. Glenn, Director

Produced by the Bureau of Educational Information Services
Richard A. Gilman, Director
Danis Collett, Production Coordinator
Michaela Tichy, Cover Designer

The Massachusetts Department of Education ensures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action, regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title IX.

BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
182 TREMONT STREET BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02111

MEMORANDUM

TO: Urban Administrators

FROM: Charles Glenn

DATE: April 1, 1977

SUBJECT: Recommendations on Paraprofessional Staff

We have been concerned for some time with the untapped potential of the hundreds of paraprofessional staff employed under the state funding programs administered by this Bureau. In the guidelines for Chapter 636 funding and in the METCO Handbook we have attempted to suggest characteristics of the role of such staff, to encourage their full participation as members of the educational team, as well as their personal career development.

Nearly a year ago we arranged with the Antioch Institute for Open Education to plan and conduct a conference around this theme, and to produce a report and recommendations for next steps which we could take. The report, by Norman Colb, was so helpful that we have decided to share it with you.

We hope in this way to encourage discussion and creative thinking, and to provide a point of reference for sharing among urban schools and school districts about their own experiences with diversified staffing. We do so well aware that significant efforts have been made in certain Title I programs, bilingual programs, and special education programs, as well as in the Chapter 636 and METCO programs which are our own special concerns.

This document does not reflect a policy of the Board of Education or of this Bureau. Some of the recommendations are directed to us, and we are actively considering them. Others are directed to you, and we would only urge that you consider them as well.

PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS: CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Education

by

Norman M. Colb
Institute of Open Education/Antioch Graduate Center

February 17, 1977

Acknowledgements

Many people contributed their efforts to the project reported on in the following pages. In particular I want to thank Jane Detenber, Mildred Downing, Sharon Hunter, and Ralph Wynn who worked with me as a planning group and whose experiences as paraprofessionals helped to formulate and sharpen the focus of the Conference; Joan Goldsmith whose gifts of support and insight helped to guide the project through its difficult moments; and Jenna Zark, administrative assistant for the project, who tirelessly coordinated all the many tasks which needed to be done.

N.C.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	page	i
Introduction	page	1
Major Themes	page	4
Short Range Plans	page	11
Long Range Plans	page	15
Summary	page	17
Appendices		
A. Conference schedule	page	18
B. Discussion questions	page	19
C. A career ladder: Cambridge's Follow Through Program	page	21

INTRODUCTION

On January 14 and 15, 1977, a Conference on the Use of Paraprofessionals in Schools brought together interested paraprofessionals, parents, and school and university staff to examine the present roles and status of auxiliary personnel in urban schools. Sponsored by The Institute of Open Education under a contract from the Massachusetts Department of Education, the Conference was designed to help the Department formulate:

> A consistent SEA position on the use and functions of paraprofessionals, including guidelines for funding paraprofessional staff, in the areas of bilingual education, special education, and improvement of the quality of education generally. This will enable SEA to better coordinate funding of paraprofessional employment and training programs.

In an effort to develop a consistent position on the employment of paraprofessionals, and formulate guidelines which would help to realize this position, the Conference called upon speakers from a variety of backgrounds to share their experiences, perceptions, and recommendations regarding paraprofessional employment programs. (See Appendix A.) The speakers' presentations familiarized the Conference with the nature of paraprofessional roles in schools; the potential these roles have for enriching the educational experiences of children in schools; alternate models for administrating paraprofessional programs, and the strengths and weaknesses of these models; the State's perspective on the political realities

of reform; and the long-term future for paraprofessional programs throughout the country.

Members of the audience were given lists of questions designed to help focus discussions and to elicit specific information from the speakers as the Conference attempted to design recommerdations for the State. (See Appendix B.)

The following pages present the recommendations which grew out of the Conference proceedings. While it would not be accurate to state that these recommendations would be endorsed by all speakers or all members of the audience, they do reflect a general consensus. Almost all of the recommendations were voiced at the Conference; a few were not, although they have been formulated so as to respond to specific issues and problems which were explored in considerable depth.

The report is structured in three sections. The first, Major Themes, presents a number of broad themes which ran through both days of the Conference. The themes combine statements of problems and general solutions to these problems. The second section, Short Range Plans, details a specific set of actions which would allow the State, working in a small number of urban school sites, to establish exemplary paraprofessional programs which could then serve as models for expanded efforts in larger numbers of sites. Long Range Plans, the final section, presents a brief scenario for moving from the point of supporting

exemplary programs to implementing funding guidelines throughout the State. Also included in this section is a listing of the elements of these guidelines.

In presenting this plan, no effort has been made to distinguish among the various State programs which support the employment of paraprofessionals in schools. While certain obvious differences set one program off from another, the position taken here is that the same basic problems beset paraprofessional programs, regardless of the source of their funding or variations in the types of tasks they are designed to accomplish. Because of the commonality of these problems, it is hoped that all State bureaus which support paraprofessional programs will adopt, in the very near future, a single and uniform set of funding guidelines.

MAJOR THEMES

A number of major themes emerged from the speakers' presentations and the discussions they provoked. As isolated and detailed below, they reflect a rough consensus drawn from the experiences of both those who have been paraprofessionals, and those, in a variety of different roles, who have worked with and trained paraprofessionals.

I. Training.

To be judged successful, a paraprofessional employment program must include a training component which is planned, deliberate, and coherent. Training is critical for meeting three types of needs:

A. Skill development training to maximize the effectiveness of the paraprofessional in his/her current role. While many paraprofessionals want to be able to train for professional roles, many others wish to acquire those skills which will allow them to be more effective as paraprofessionals. Training for paraprofessionals who wish to, or need to, upgrade the skills involved in their current roles might include areas such as classroom management, disciplinary techniques, basic literacy, and tutoring strategies. These are broadly applicable skills which, it can be assumed, would equip adults to work effectively in a wide range of paraprofessional roles in divers settings.

B. Collaboration training to increase the likelihood of cooperation between paraprofessionals and professional staff, and to realize the potential benefits of such cooperation. Successful paraprofessional employment programs seem almost always to rest on two related assumptions: first, that paraprofessionals will make use of their abilities to the extent that they are given clearly defined tasks to do, and, second, that teachers need training to help them in defining these tasks.

It is essential that such training involve both paraprofessionals and those professionals (including the principal, if possible) with whom the paraprofessionals will work. Ideally, this training, should be provided simultaneously to both populations. Doing so would sharply minimize the possibility of misunderstanding and confusion; both groups would be able to hear and respond to the same messages at the same time; their subsequent planning sessions would then take place within a common frame of reference.

There seems to be very little or no need to provide this type of training for paraprofessionals whose major responsibilities are to maintain order on busses or in the cafeteria, or to perform clerical tasks in the office. Collaboration training is critical to the extent that paraprofessionals are involved in instructional activities with children (whether these activities take place in or out of the teacher's classroom setting).

When paraprofessionals are involved in direct instruction, certain changes obviously occur in the duties of the professional teaching staff. New duties, in turn, call upon teachers to employ new skills. These factors suggest that responsibility for carrying out this type of training should not be given to the teaching staff. Rather, a third party, (e.g., a program coordinator, or a university faculty member) should be employed to conduct the training.

Experience suggests that collaboration training should be rooted in - although not necessarily limited to - the needs of specific children in specific classrooms. The focus should be on designing and implementing instructional interventions for these children. Theoretical or abstract considerations of curriculum and instruction should be explored only as needed; the training should not emphasize these topics.

C. Career advancement training to allow the paraprofessional to acquire entry level skills for professional roles. If it is assumed that acceptance of competency-based certification for professional positions is far in the future, then "entry level skills" must be measured by their traditional surrogate - college credits. If paraprofessionals are to be able to acquire the requisite college credits, they must have ready access to college-level courses. Such courses should be available free, or at a reasonable cost; and the individual courses should be clearly identified as to whether or not they satisfy specific certification requirements.

(Several paraprofessionals recounted their unfortunate experiences in relation to this last point: having been urged to take particular courses for purposes of securing certification, they did so at considerable expense in time and money, only to learn later that these courses failed to fulfill the requirements for the certification they sought. Whether or not such is the case, information about certification is perceived as being ambiguous and difficult to obtain. Any career advancement training program must take as a top priority the task of providing paraprofessionals with readable information about certification in general, and about the utility of each available course in fulfilling the requirements for specific types of certification. The path to professional status is clearer to those who have travelled it than to those who wish to embark on it.)

II. Administrative and supervisory support.

To be successful, a paraprofessional employment program requires such support for at least four reasons:

A. Planning, coordinating and/or conducting the training programs outlined above. Even if a college or university were to assume responsibility for all three types of training, the need for administrative coordination and control of the training is clear. Specific functions need to be added to existing administrative roles, or combined into a new role - possibly that of paraprofessional coordinator. Among the functions involved in administering the training component are the following:

1. defining the specific needs, both for instruction and for ego support, to be met by the training program;

2. planning the program to meet these needs, or slecting a pre-existing university program on the basis of its ability to do so;

3. ensuring that paraprofessionals secure accurate certification information about the certification process itself, and about the suitability of a given course for meeting certification requirements;

4. evaluating the effectiveness of the various training programs in achieveing their purposes.

B. Recruiting, screening and placing paraprofessionals in schools. For the benefit of individual paraprofessionals, as well as for the benefit of the total program itself, it is essential that successful candidates be placed in roles in which they have a good chance of succeeding. Careful placements rest on knowledge of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, and on detailed knowledge of the roles available and the schools in which these roles exist.

C. Establishing and implementing a career ladder and career lattice. As used here, the term career ladder refers to a hierarchy of roles filled by paraprofessionals. Cambridge's Follow Through Program, for example, includes four different roles (Assistant I, Assistant II, Associate I, and Associate II), each with its own salary schedule and role description. (See Appendix C.)

If a career ladder exists in the school or district, there is a need to base advancement on rational criteria applied even-handedly. For purposes of morale, program stability, and positive relations with the community, it is imperative that performance criteria be applied uniformly. The importance of uniform procedures suggests that there is a need to centralize the function of performance review in a single person or office. While principals and cooperating teachers certainly should be involved in the performance review process, their data should be submitted to an office external to the school for purposes of review, corroboration, and

appropriate career advancement action. It should be the duty of this external office to ensure that performance criteria have been applied fairly, and that recommendations regarding movement on the career ladder have been based on these criteria.

As important as it is that performance criteria be applied fairly, it is equally important that they be applied humanely and in a supportive atmosphere. There is a critical need to provide paraprofessionals with ego support as they begin to receive information about their effectiveness and establish goals for their growth and development.

D. Fostering program stability. Because paraprofessionals often are paid with "soft money," job security is a major issue and probably contributes to staffing and program instability. There is a need to signal the stability of various paraprofessional employment programs through the creation of an administrative position, or through the clear assignment of paraprofessional employment functions to an existing administrative position. Charging an administrator with responsibility for paraprofessional programs would do more than simple signal administrative support; it also would provide paraprofessionals with an advocate who would be well placed to influence the district's budgetary decision, and actively seek out additional sources of funding. In short, then, the creation of an administrative position would help to ensure program continuity which, in turn, would do much to encourage paraprofessionals to make long-term commitments to serving in schools.

III. State Support.

If paraprofessional programs are to show real and lasting improvement over time, there is a need for the State Department of Education to support a long-term commitment to the development of these programs. Because of the vicissitudes of funding and the relatively weak political influence of paraprofessionals on decision-making in local districts, the State cannot assume that paraprofessional

programs will grow and develop on the basis of their demonstrated or potential utility. The State must exert leadership in the following ways:

A. Establishing model programs. As detailed in the following two sections of this set of recommendations, the State should encourage the establishment of a small number of exemplary programs during the 1977-78 school year, and greater numbers of such programs in the years thereafter. The exemplary programs should serve as models for schools and districts which seek to secure State funding for programs which involve the funding of paraprofessional positions.

B. Collecting survey information. The State should obtain more and better information than it currently has about paraprofessionals in schools. A survey should be conducted to determine the numbers of paraprofessionals employed in various capacities; the types of activities assigned to paraprofessionals; the generic and specific titles of programs in which paraprofessionals work (e.g., general classroom instruction, Title I); the salaries earned in different programs and roles; and the number of former paraprofessionals who have moved into professional roles in the same district. The information gathered by the survey should be used to help refine the guidelines presented in the next sections of this report and to establish the need for additional guidelines. The information also should be used as base-line data for assessing the impact of these guidelines over time.

C. Establishing minimum salaries. Based on the results of this survey and other sources of information, the State should seek to establish minimum salary scales for paraprofessionals. These scales should reflect the competencies and skills involved in the various categories of paraprofessional employment. (See Appendix C.) Further, as a long-range objective, the State should encourage School Committees to negotiate salary scales for paraprofessionals with paraprofessionals represented either as a separate unit in the teachers' bargaining apparatus, or by their own independent bargaining unit.

D. Providing information. The State should use its resources to establish or to encourage the establishment of an information network responsive to the needs of paraprofessionals. The network envisioned here should consist of one or both of the following components:

A central repository for information about available positions, described by duties and rate of pay; the names and school addresses of paraprofessionals; and descriptions, titles, locations, and costs of all college and university programs tailored to meet the career advancement (certification) needs of paraprofessionals.

A newsletter, developed either through State seed money or as a commercial venture, which would speak directly to the needs of paraprofessionals by detailing employment opportunities, exemplary programs, training and certification information, and pertinent legislation.

E. Fostering effective organization. The State should provide active encouragement and financial support for a state-wide paraprofessional advocacy organization. Operated by paraprofessionals, such an organization would be able to initiate, monitor and lobby for legislation sensitive to and supportive of the needs of paraprofessionals in schools. In addition, the organization could serve as the mechanism through which action could be taken on points C and D, above.

F. Moving towards competency-based certification. The State should continue its efforts to replace its traditional process of teacher certification with one based on the demonstration of instructional competencies. (The training model outlined in the next sections could be used to provide the primary system through which paraprofessionals demonstrate their competencies for purposes of securing professional certification. As one of its tasks, the training institution would agree to assess a paraprofessional's control over those competencies which the State has established as requirements for certification.)

SHORT RANGE PLANS

I. During the current school year the State should begin to plan for a small number of exemplary paraprofessional programs which can become operational in September, 1977. It is suggested that this pilot effort be undertaken in no more than three urban school systems which should be selected by State Department personnel.

Once the urban districts have been identified, the superintendent of each district should be invited to submit funding proposals within a fixed range for a maximum of five schools. Proposals should include the following information:

- -The major types of tasks to be performed by paraprofessionals employed under the terms of the grant;
- -The number of, and rates of pay for, these paraprofessionals (Paraprofessionals are to be hired for new positions; funding may not be used to pay for positions currently carried in the schools' budgets);
- -A plan for recruiting the paraprofessionals from the immediate community;
- -The amount of time teachers could be available for joint training with paraprofessionals (either those hired under the grant, or, preferable, all those employed in the school);
- -A mechanism for securing placements for paraprofessionals which make the best use of their strengths and interests (e.g., a self-assessment coupled with an inventory of teacher needs);
- -A supervision model which provides paraprofessionals with on-going information about their performance and emotional support for their growth;

-An estimate of the amount of initial training needed by paraprofessionals; of the amount of joint long-term training needed by paraprofessionals and by the teachers with whom they work; and of the amount of career change and advancement training desired by paraprofessionals.

-A budget for this training.

-A preliminary evaluation design. (See page 14.)

-An evaluation budget.

II. As soon as the schools have been selected for funding, colleges, universities, and other appropriate training institutions within a reasonable distance from the schools should be altered to the existence of the pilot programs and invited to submit training proposals. Proposals should be drafted so as to include the following information:

-Descriptions of those courses which have traditionally been scheduled, or which the institution would be willing to schedule, so as not to interfere with the paraprofessionals' work day. (This information would not be needed, of course, if the public school would be willing to endorse paraprofessionals attending courses during the normal work day without reduction in pay for time away from work.) Included in each description should be an indication of the specific type(s) of certification, if any, which a course may be used to satisfy, the cost per credit hour, and as much specific information about course content as reasonably can be communicated.

-A listing of the areas of expertise of at least three members of the faculty who could be called upon, on a regular basis, to provide training and emotional support for paraprofessionals employed by the model school and for those teachers with whom the paraprofessionals are scheduled to work.

-An indication of the hours each week that these faculty members could work at the school.

-The estimated cost per hour for such faculty work.

III. In those instances in which more than one training institution submits a proposal for working in a given target school, the competing proposals should be reviewed and rated by the following people: the school's principal, those members of the staff who have indicated their willingness to work with paraprofessionals, any paraprofessionals currently working in the school, representatives of the parent community, and representatives of the State Department. Ratings should be made on the following criteria:

-Appropriateness of the courses, as described, to the needs of the school.

-Appropriateness of the consultant's expertise to the school's need for training and the paraprofessionals' need for support.

-Availability of the consultants during times which are least disruptive to the school's normal functioning.

IV. Once a training institution has been selected by the principal, a day-long meeting should be held in each school to draft specific plans for the coming year. In attendance should be the principal, at least two teachers scheduled to work with paraprofessionals during the project, paraprofessionals currently employed by the school and any who may have been hired for the pilot year, the consultants identified by the training institution, and an independent evaluator. The purposes of this training session are to identify and/or describe:

-Those areas in which paraprofessionals will need training of the general type described in Major Themes, I.

-A training model which will encourage teachers and paraprofessionals to work together effectively in reference to a specified set of instructional tasks.

-An evaluation scheme which will allow the State Department to assess the extent to which the project has contributed to the school's effectiveness; to the development of paraprofessionals' competencies; to school-community relations; and to other goals which the school may ascribe to the project.

V. Preliminary evaluations of these pilot projects should be concluded by February, 1978. In addition to those variables listed above, evaluations should attempt to determine which structural characteristics of the various programs are most closely associated with paraprofessionals' feelings of job satisfaction, and with increased acceptance of paraprofessionals serving in expanding roles.

VI. By February, 1978, the State should have concluded a survey to obtain the information, described on page 9, about paraprofessionals in schools.

VII. The information produced by the program evaluations and by the State survey should be used in refining the guidelines for paraprofessional employment proposals submitted after the conclusion of this pilot phase. As revised, the proposal guidelines should be adopted uniformly by all State-funded programs which support the employment of paraprofessionals in schools.

LONG RANGE PLANS

I. Unless modified by data gathered during the pilot phase, the guidelines for funding paraprofessional programs beyond the 1977-78 school year should call for the same information listed on pages 11 and 12.

The guidelines should also call for two additional components:

-A procedure which allows paraprofessionals to advance from one rate of pay to another. This procedure is to be based on length of service, job complexity, and job performance.

-An administrative structure to coordinate and/or provide:

-recruitment, screening, and placement;
-training programs;
-performance review (including goal setting and emotional support);
-salary advancement.

II. Colleges, universities and other appropriate training institutions should be thoroughly familiarized with the results of the pilot projects and should be invited to submit training proposals of the type detailed in the previous section.

Unless modified by the pilot projects' evaulation findings, training proposals should contain the information described in Short Range Plans. The proposals should also contain the following additional component:

-A procedure which allows the training institution to assess the instructional competencies of those paraprofessionals who wish to secure certification as professional teachers.

III. Early in the 1978-79 school year, the State Department should begin to create the information network described on page 10. It should alert all paraprofessionals employed with State-administered funds to the existence of the network and detail those needs which the network can be used to meet.

IV. The evaluative data produced at the end of the 1978-79 school year should be used to refine further the State's funding guidelines. Beyond the 1978-79 school year, evaluative data should be used to reshape the guidelines on a regular basis.

SUMMARY

Approximately 11,000 paraprofessionals now work in public schools throughout Massachusetts. Despite their large and growing influence in schools, paraprofessionals often see themselves as undervalued, underutilized, underpaid, and unable to obtain the training they need either to perform their current roles or for advancement to professional status.

That paraprofessionals can make meaningful contributions to the life of a school is strongly supported by a growing body of research. They represent a vast but unrealized pool of talent which could be of tremendous benefit to children.

The problems paraprofessionals face in their work reflect, in large measure, a lack of appropriate administrative and supervisory structures on the level of the school, the school district, and the State. Massachusetts has given little attention to providing paraprofessionals with the types of systematic training and supervision long afforted to teachers and to others who assume responsibility for working with children.

The plans developed in this report attempt to provide paraprofessionals with the support they need if they are to make those contributions they seem so amply able to make.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE ON PARAPROFESSIONALS

IN SCHOOLS

January 14 and 15, 1977

Friday, January 14

5:00-5:30 Registration and coffee
5:30-5:45 Welcome and overview of conference
Joan Goldsmith and Eileen Brown, Co-Directors, Institute of Open Education
Norman Colb, Conference Coordinator
5:45-6:15 A Paraprofessional Reflects on Her Experience
Ms. Sharon Hunter
6:15-7:00 Dinner
7:00-7:45 Career Ladders for Paraprofessionals: The Philosopher's and the Pragmatist's Perspectives
Dr. Stephen Kaagan, Deputy Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts
7:45-8:00 Questions and responses
8:00-8:45 Career Development: Implementing Career Ladders for Paraprofessionals
Ms. Gail Eisenkraft, Career Development Coordinator, Cambridge Follow Through Program
8:45-9:00 Questions and responses
9:00-10:30 Small group discussion

Saturday, January 15

9:30-10:00 Coffee
10:00-10:45 Paraprofessional Programs in the Urban School Setting
Dr. Kenneth Haskins, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education
10:45-11:00 Questions and responses
11:00-11:45 Characteristics of Exemplary Paraprofessional Programs
Dr. Alan Gartner, Professor, Center for Advanced Study of Education, Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York
11:45-12:00 Questions and responses
12:00-1:00 Lunch
1:00-1:30 Planning and Training for Teacher Support Services in the Classroom
Ms. Lois Sockel, Primary Consultant Newton Public Schools
1:30-1:45 Questions and responses
1:45-2:15 Paraprofessional Programs in an Urban Middle School: A Principal's Perspective
Mr. Daniel Kearns, Principal, The Mary Curley School, Boston Public Schools
2:15-2:30 Questions and responses
2:30-3:45 Small group discussion
3:45-4:15 Small group reports
4:15-4:30 Concluding remarks

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

Career Advancement Issues
Friday evening

1. What are the specific essential minimal components of an acceptable career development or advancement program for paraprofessionals.

2. To what extent should it be the employing school district's responsibility to provide paraprofessionals with planned career advancement opportunities? (Should responsibility extend to making tuition payments? What proportion of payments? Does responsibility extend to providing paraprofessionals with released time during the work day?)

3. Should the State be urged to move towards full competency-based certification? (What measures should be applied in demonstrating competency?)

4. What specific structures are needed in the school to allow paraprofessionals to demonstrate their competencies? (Should paraprofessionals have traditional student teaching experiences? What institution should sponsor such student teaching?)

5. Should there be a required grievance procedure to protect the paraprofessional's access to career advancement opportunities?

Training and Effectiveness Issues
Saturday afternoon

1. What types of components of administrative structure seem to maximize the effectiveness of paraprofessionals in an instructional setting? (Supervision? What amount? By whom?)

2. In general, who should have the primary responsibility for training paraprofessionals? Classroom teachers? Principals? System-wide program administrators?

3. Should classroom teachers be required to participate in training of any kind before they work with a paraprofessional? (Should teachers be paid for such participation?)

4. In the school organization, who is best suited to evaluate the extent of, and the effectiveness of the cooperation between teachers and principals? (How should such evaluation be conducted? What measures should be used?)

APPENDIX C

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FOLLOW THROUGH TEACHER ASSISTANT ROLE AND FUNCTIONS

ASSISTANT I

The Assistant I is primarily involved in a learning experience. She works under the supervision of the cooperating teacher, and participates with the teacher in all aspects of the classroom, as much as she is able.

1. Building the teaching team - awareness of other adults.
2. Learning to observe children.
3. Learning to interact in a supportive manner with children.
4. Becoming familiar with curriculum - ie skills and their development through children's interests.
5. Learning to use materials.
6. Assisting in increasing parental communication and involvement.
7. Learning record keeping.
8. Beginning to take small groups that are planned and evaluated with teacher.
9. Learning classroom management and control.

ASSISTANT II

The Assistant II is still a learner but has begun to assume greater responsibility in classroom. She is responsible for short term planning and implementation in one or more curriculum areas. She and the teacher share the evaluation and record keeping of her group(s). The tasks of the Assistant I are expanded in keeping with the assistants increasing competencies.

ASSOCIATE I

The Associate I is responsible for the long term planning and implementation of one curriculum area and is learning others. She knows the sequence of skill development in the curriculum area she carries (ie what precedes and what follows, where child is at). She is expected to do the record keeping for her area and be able to share this with teacher. She is expected to be competent in areas learned as Assistant I and II, can control the entire class, etc.

ASSOCIATE II

Knows major curriculum areas and can implement. Co-responsible for total class.

CAREER LADDER FOR CAMBRIDGE FOLLOW THROUGH TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Assistant I:	4500	1	
	4700	2	200 increase
	4900		
	15 credits		
Assistant II:			
	5200	4	
	5500	5	
	5800	6	300 increase
	6100	7	
	6400	8	
	ASSOCIATE DEGREE		
AssociateI:	6800	9	400 increase
	7000	10	200 increase
	7200	11	200 increase
	90 credits		
Associate II:	7383	12	
	7704	13	present ladder figures
	8025	14	